



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/971,750	10/04/2001	Robert R. Hamden	12-1222	4233
23446	7590	02/14/2005	EXAMINER	
MCANDREWS HELD & MALLOY, LTD 500 WEST MADISON STREET SUITE 3400 CHICAGO, IL 60661				BARNIE, REXFORD N
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2643				

DATE MAILED: 02/14/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/971,750	HARNDEN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	REXFORD N BARNIE	2643	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 October 2001.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 9-25 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 9-25 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.


REXFORD BARNIE
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Claims 9 and 19 recites the limitation "the second rate" in the claims. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Therefore, the limitation would not be considered for examination purposes.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 9 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Harris (US 2003/0118134) or (US 2003/0076907).

Regarding claim 9, Harris teaches a resampling filter structure for demodulating wireless signals in (see figs. 11-13, 21, [0038-0041] of '907 or figs. 11-20 of '134) with the claimed limitation including a resampling means and a DFT.

Regarding claim 19, Harris teaches a resampling filter structure for demodulating wireless signals in (see figs. 11-13, 21, [0038-0041] of '907 or figs. 11-20 of '134) with the claimed limitation including a resampling means and a DFT.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 10-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harris (US 2003/0118134) or (US 2003/0076907) in view of Lehman et al. (US Pat# 6,282,184) or Posti (US 2002/0054651).

Regarding claims 10-13, Harris fails to teach an A/D converter and a GSM channelizer.

Posti teaches a device and method for reducing the amplitude of signals comprising of an ADC, DFT, a channeliser and with the capable of functioning in a GSM environment in (see figs. 3-4, [0047]).

Lehman teaches a common digitizing rate for cell sites in a cellular radio comprising of an ADC and a GSM channelizer in (see figs. and disclosure).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of either Posti or Lehman into that of Harris thus making it possible to process signals efficiently and effectively in a GSM environment using any adjustment/sampling desired.

Claims 14-18 and 20-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harris (US 2003/0118134) or (US 2003/0076907) in view of Zangi (US Pat# 5,999,573) or Allpress (US Pat# 5,926,455) or Sonalkar et al. (US Pat# 6,356,569).

Regarding claims 14-18, Harris fails to teach the claimed subject matter including a polyphase filter.

Zangi teaches a channelization with variable sampling frequency in (see figs. 3-5 and disclosure) which teaches the possibility of having polyphase filter connected to DFT.

Allpress teaches recursive filters for polyphase structures in (see figs.) with a plurality of filters connected to a DFT.

Sonalkar teaches a digital channelizer with arbitrary output sampling in (see figs.) comprising of a plurality of polyphase filters connected to DFT.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of either one of the secondary references into that of Harris thus making it possible to provide effective channelization.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **REXFORD N BARNIE** whose telephone number is (703)306-2744. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, CURTIS KUNTZ can be reached on (703) 305-4708. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

PRIMARY EXAMINER
REXFORD BARNIE
02/11/05

RBarnie
REXFORD BARNIE
PRIMARY EXAMINER